

an editor of the magazine of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a foundation set up by Robert Hutchins, a high priest of the "New Age" cult. Dennis is also on the boards of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the ultra-liberal People for the American Way.

Dennis is also the financial angel for the pro-drug wing of the Democratic Party in the state of Illinois. The LaRouche movement in that state has built an electoral organization which has repeatedly demonstrated popular support for the anti-drug platform of its candidates. In response, the Illinois drug lobby has mobilized a 10-year-long campaign to harass and outlaw the movement, culminating in fraudulent prosecutions of political fundraisers being coordinated by the Attorney General's office. In 1986, when Adlai Stevenson III was confronted with the option of running for governor alongside two popular LaRouche-associated candidates, it was Richard Dennis who provided the funds which enabled Stevenson to run on a third-party ticket.

### Who benefits?

Despite the libertarian fantasies of tax revenue bonanzas to be gained by legalizing drugs on the street, the real financial value of the drug trade is realized by the international banking cartels which dominate the money flows associated with the trade. The failure of successive U.S. administrations to seriously attack these havens, reveals the devastating fallacy behind those who say that we have already lost the war on drugs. On the contrary, the war on drugs has not yet begun in earnest, and will not do so until harsh measures are taken to shut down those money flows.

What the drug-legalizers fear now more than anything else, is that the Bush administration will take that step. Their concern is that *any* disruption of the huge pyramiding of indebtedness over the past few years will trigger an uncontrollable banking collapse. As the *Economist* put it, "The world is awash with crypto-dollars, avoiding tax or evading exchange-controls; it is impossible to sort out the drug money from the rest."

And there is certainly growing pressure toward going after the big international and New York-based drug money establishments such as Merrill Lynch and Chase Manhattan. Senior military officials and former Reagan administration anti-drug specialists have told this news service that the big limitation they see in the Bush program is a weak attack on the money-laundering facilities. "You can't hit this problem until you hit the banks—and I don't mean the little banks in Miami—I mean you have to take down Chase Manhattan," was the way one put it. Also, the heroic stand of Lyndon LaRouche and his associates against the drug bankers, has given others the courage to speak out.

One of the chief demagogical arguments of the drug-legalizers, is that the only alternative to legalization, would be a repressive police state which would trample on fundamental Constitutional and human rights. Typical was the

argumentation of the London *Times* that President Bush "realizes that criminal sanctions can curb demand only through an extraordinary increase in the police presence. As the U.S. moves down this path, the implications for personal freedom will become increasingly obvious. In the end, the price for treating a public health problem as a crime should prove too much for even the present level of public hysteria to tolerate."

The ironic truth is that the same political forces which have so far refused to treat the drug traffickers as an enemy power subject to *martial* law, have been busily engaged in transforming U.S. *civil* and *criminal* law into a means turning the United States into a police state. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, for instance, has delivered speech upon speech in the past weeks extolling the ability of the Department of Justice to tackle the drug-trafficking problem the same way it has tackled every other problem—with the aggressive use of RICO (racketeering) and related conspiracy statutes, and increased dependence on asset forfeiture techniques of dubious legality.

This constitutes perhaps the weakest flank in the Bush administration's announced policy against drugs, and is summed up by the fact that the man whom the drug lobby hates the most, Lyndon LaRouche, remains in jail on the orders of those who work for the pro-legalization financial and political circles.

---

## Documentation

---

### LaRouche's anti-drug plan

*On March 13, 1985, Lyndon LaRouche addressed a Mexico City conference on the illegal drug traffic. This is an abbreviated summary of his 15-point "war-plan."*

1) The international drug traffic has become an evil and powerful government in its own right . . . upon which we must declare war . . . which we must win in the same spirit the United States fought for the unconditional defeat of Nazism between 1941 and 1945.

2) . . . The mandate given to law-enforcement forces deployed in support of this war, must be the principle that collaboration with the drug traffic or with the financier or political forces of the international drug traffickers, is treason in time of war. . . .

3) A treaty of alliance for conduct of war, should be established between the United States and the governments of Ibero-American states which join the War on Drugs alliance. . . .

4) Under the auspices of this treaty, provisions for actions of a joint military command should be elaborated . . . to the effect that necessary forms of joint military and law-enforcement action do not subvert the national sovereignty of any of the allied nations. . . .

5) . . . Military and related actions of warfare against targets of the War on Drugs, should be conducted by assigned forces of the nation on whose territory the action occurs.

6) Technologies appropriate to detection and confirmation of growing, processing, and transport of drugs, including satellite-based and aircraft-based systems of detection, should be supplied with assistance of the United States. . . .

7) With aid of the same technologies, processing-centers must be detected and confirmed, and each destroyed promptly in the same manner as fields growing relevant crops.

8) Borders among the allied nations, and borders with other nations, must be virtually hermetically sealed against drug traffic across borders. . . .

9) A system of total regulation of financial institutions, to the effect of detecting deposits, outbound transfers, and inbound transfer of funds, which might be reasonably suspected of being funds secured from drug trafficking, must be established and maintained.

10) All real-estate, business enterprises, financial institutions, and personal funds, shown to be employed in the growing, processing, transport, or sale of unlawful drugs, should be taken into military custody immediately, and confiscated in the manner of military actions in time of war. . . .

11) The primary objective of the War on Drugs, is military in nature: to destroy the enemy quasi-state, the international drug trafficking interest, by destroying or confiscating that quasi-state's economic and financial resources. . . .

12) Special attention should be concentrated on those banks, insurance enterprises, and other business institutions which are in fact elements of an international financial cartel coordinating the flow of hundreds of billions annually of revenues from the international drug traffic. Such entities should be classed as outlaws according to the "crimes against humanity" doctrine elaborated at the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal. . . .

13) . . . Once all significant production of drugs in the Americas is exterminated, the War on Drugs enters a second phase, in which the war concentrates on combatting the conducting of drugs from sources outside the Hemisphere.

14) . . . Political arms of the financial interests associated with the conducting of revenues from the drug traffic . . . are therefore to be treated in the manner Nazi-sympathizer operations were treated in the United States during World War II.

15) The War on Drugs should include agreed provisions for allotment of confiscated billions of dollars of assets of the drug trafficking interests to beneficial purposes of economic development, in basic economic infrastructure, agriculture, and goods-producing industry. . . .

## Former congressman backs LaRouche appeal

by Andrew Rotstein

Former U.S. Rep. Patrick Swindall (R-Ga.), sentenced on Aug. 28 for a federal perjury conviction, said that a growing pattern of violations of due process by federal prosecutors and judges threatens to destroy the basic human rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Swindall, an attorney who served four years on the House Judiciary Committee, made the comments on Aug. 31 in co-signing the *amicus curiae* brief already endorsed by over 400 American lawyers, calling for reversal of the convictions of Lyndon LaRouche and six associates.

Swindall had been caught in a federal sting operation, where a money-laundering ring was being run by an undercover IRS agent. Swindall initially accepted, but, fearing illegality, soon returned a large loan from the group to finance a home he was building. He was recently convicted for perjuring himself before a grand jury in 1988, when he claimed he could not recall certain details of conversations with members of the ring.

The Swindall case was marked by abuses that have become familiar in the Justice Department's cynical and politically targeted campaign against "public corruption":

- Even though all participants suspected of money-laundering had already been indicted, U.S. Attorney Robert Barr—whose appointment to office Swindall was known to have vigorously opposed—convened a new grand jury to attempt to come up with some other charge, like perjury, against Swindall, since the congressman had eventually walked away from the money-washing trap;

- The indictment took place in the final weeks of the 1988 campaign, costing Swindall his reelection;

- Grand jury tapes and transcripts were illegally leaked, then carefully edited and publicized by the media, including the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, a longtime Swindall adversary, to put the politician in the most unfavorable possible light;

- U.S. District Judge Richard Freeman denied a defense motion to move the trial out of Atlanta, despite massive prejudicial news coverage;

- In jury selection, Freeman accepted prospective jurors' subjective claim of impartiality, although some jurors' other statements clearly revealed bias.

In addition, the government committed several extraordinary misdeeds in the case.